



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,645	12/29/2000	Delmar Lanzer	MRI0003	9250

27268 7590 05/18/2005
BAKER & DANIELS LLP
300 NORTH MERIDIAN STREET
SUITE 2700
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204

EXAMINER

FLORES SANCHEZ, OMAR

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/751,645		LANZER, DELMAR	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Omar Flores-Sánchez		3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11-15, 17-29, 34-44, 48 and 49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-8, 11-13, 17-24, 28, 29 and 34-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 14, 15, 25-27, 29, 41-44, 48 and 49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment received on 02/09/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 14-15, 25-27, 29, 31-32, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by O. F. Kleeb et al. (1,730,938).

Kleeb discloses (Fig. 1-4) the invention including a platform (1 and 2), a support plate 19, a saw assembly, a balancing apparatus 60, a saw blade 22, an oscillating mechanism (see Fig. 1), and a pair of pivot supports 21, a counterweight 61, a beam 20 and an aperture (Fig. 1 and 2). The balancing apparatus 60 and the support plate 19 move in opposite directions. More specifically, when the balancing apparatus goes up, the support plate goes down, and vice-versa.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3724

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O. F. Kleeb et al. in view of A. C. Jacobson.

Kleeb discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a platform 1, a support plate 19, a saw assembly, a balancing apparatus 60, a saw blade 22, an oscillating mechanism (see Fig. 1), and a pivot support 21, a counterweight 61, a beam 20 and an aperture (Fig. 1 and 2). Kleeb does not show a rotatable member and a fixed member. However, Jacobson teaches the use of a rotatable member 36 and a fixed member 1 for the purpose of rotating the base 2. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kleeb's cutter by providing the rotatable member and a fixed member as taught by Jacobson in order to set the device to any degree.

6. Claims 1, 14, 15, 25-27, 29, 41-42, 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lavis (4163404) in view of O. F. Kleeb et al. (1,730,938).

Lavis discloses (Fig. 1-9) the invention substantially as claimed including a platform (1-4), a support plate (phantom line in Fig. 2), a saw assembly 35, a balancing apparatus/ counterweight 21, a saw blade 38 and a pair of pivot supports 6 and an aperture (Fig. 3). The balancing apparatus 21 and the support plate 9 move in opposite directions. More specifically, when the balancing apparatus goes up, the support plate goes down, and vice-versa. Lavis does not show an oscillating mechanism and a beam. However, Kleeb et al. teach the use of an oscillating mechanism (see Fig. 1) and a beam 20 for the purpose of automatically driving the saw. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 3724

was made to have modified Lavis's device by providing the oscillating mechanism and the beam as taught by Kleeb et al. in order to obtain a device that automatically drive the saw.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that balancing apparatus 60/counterweight 61 of Kleeb et al. are not arranged to move relative to the saw blade during operation and is not coupled to the oscillating saw means for movement relative to the oscillating saw means during use. However, balancing apparatus 60/counterweight 61 of Kleeb et al. are arranged to move relative to the saw blade during operation, when the saw moves down balancing apparatus 60/counterweight 61 moves up relative to the saw 22. Also, balancing apparatus 60/ counterweight 61 of Kleeb et al. are coupled to the oscillating saw means (see Fig. 1) by member 19 for movement relative to the oscillating saw means during use. Regarding Levis's prior art, Levis's counterbalance 21 moves relative to the saw assembly 35, when the saw assembly 35 moves down counterbalance 21 moves up relative to the saw assembly 35.

Conclusion


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Omar Flores-Sánchez whose telephone number is 571-272-4507. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 3724

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 571-272-4514. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ofs
May 9, 2005



Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700